

Appl. No. : 08/943,356
Filed : October 1, 1997

disclose "an alert." The Examiner asserts, however, that Bonnell discloses an event manager that is responsible for keeping a record of various occurrences throughout the computer network including occurrence of alarm conditions and their resolution. The Examiner takes the position that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bonnell by specifying alerts in place of events as taught by Bonnell since the same functionality is achieved.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Bonnell does not teach a method which allows a user to selectively disable (or enable) a display of one or more alerts to the user, as disclosed in Claim 1 of the claimed invention. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify this aspect of the claimed invention. Thus, the event manager in Bonnell does not teach the method as claimed in Claim 1. Nor is there any teaching in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bonnell to achieve the same functionality as the claimed invention. For this reason, withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection as to Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Rejection of Claims 2-3 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

As to Claims 2-3, the Examiner takes the position that Bonnell teaches the claimed limitation of storing whether each of said alerts is disabled or enabled in a plurality of variables. The Examiner further states that Bonnell teaches storing information about the enabled and disabled alerts in a storage medium using an event filter and a system agent.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Bonnell discloses a table of consoles (col. 10, line 63 to col. 11, line 16; Figure 17) which are registered with an agent to receive only certain events from the agent through event filters (Figures 22-23). Each console may also send a registration message to the agent to indicate which types of information the console desires to receive, such as application-level, instance-level or parameter-level information (col. 11, line 17 to col. 12, line 51; Figures 18-20). If a console is not "interested" in receiving certain information from an agent, the agent does not send that information to the console.

Bonnell does not teach the claimed limitation of storing variables which indicate whether the display of each of the alert notifications to the user is disabled or enabled, as claimed in Claim 2 of the claimed invention. Claims 1-2 have been amended to clarify this aspect of the claimed invention, and Claim 3 is dependent from Claims 1 and 2. For this reason alone, withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. : 08/943,356
Filed : October 1, 1997

In the alternative, there is another reason for withdrawing the 103(a) rejection. In one embodiment of the claimed invention, the method comprises receiving all alerts (both enabled and disabled for display) from an agent (at a server computer) and recording information about all of the alerts in a storage medium at a user computer for easy access by the user if the user decides to view the alerts. The method of Claim 3 comprises storing information about the alerts which are disabled from being displayed to the user in a storage medium at the user computer.

In contrast, the system in Bonnell uses interest masks, instance interest masks, parameter interest masks and event filters to prevent a console from receiving particular information from an agent (col. 11, lines 42-46; col. 13, lines 9-34). In other words, "events are only reported to interested consoles, and even then only to interested consoles whose event filters are satisfied by the event" (col. 14, lines 7-12). Bonnell does not teach an alert module which records information about the alerts which are received by the user computer and disabled from being displayed to the user in a storage medium at the user computer. Because Bonnell teaches event filters which prevent a console from even receiving particular information from an agent, Bonnell teaches away from the claimed invention. Thus, for this reason, withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner relies on only one of the two reasons above for withdrawing the 103(a) rejection, the other reason shall be deemed withdrawn by Applicant and shall not be construed as a basis for patentability relied on by Applicant.

Discussion of Rejection of Claims 4-5 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

As to Claims 4-5, the Examiner asserts that Bonnell teaches recording a recommended course of action associated with one of the alerts and generating a user interface which directs the selection of the alerts by providing a description of the alerts using a graphical interface module.

Claim 4 has been amended to clarify the claimed limitation of storing, at the user computer, a recommended course of action associated with the alerts enabled or disabled for display to the user. As to Claim 5, Bonnell does not teach the claimed limitation of generating a user interface which allows a user to select one or more alerts for display to the user by providing a description of the alerts. Claim 5 has been amended in accordance with amended Claim 1 to clarify the selection of alerts by the user for display to the user. Withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Rejection of Claims 6-10 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Appl. No. : 08/943,356
Filed : October 1, 1997

As to Claims 6-10, the Examiner takes the position that Bonnell teaches a user interface which enables selected alerts in response to an enable command or disables selected alerts in response to a disable command, wherein the alerts are displayed in an alert notification window that is configured to display the name of a component associated with one of the alerts. The Examiner further states that Bonnell teaches an alert notification window which is configured to display a recommended course of action associated with one of the alerts using a graphical user interface.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. As explained above with respect to Claim 5, Bonnell does not teach generating a user interface which allows a user to select one or more alerts for display to the user by providing a description of the alerts. Claims 6-10 are dependent from Claim 5, which has been amended in accordance with amended Claim 1 to clarify the selection of alerts by the user to be displayed to the user. Withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Moreover, for Claim 8, Bonnell does not teach or suggest displaying alerts, which were selectively enabled for display by the user, in an alert notification window to the user. Claim 8 has been amended to clarify this aspect of the claimed invention. Withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 9-10 are dependent from Claim 8, which has been amended. Withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Rejection of Claims 11-12 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

As to Claims 11-12, the Examiner takes the position that Bonnell teaches the claimed limitation of generating a notification regarding the status of at least one component of the computer, wherein the notification comprises a first code having a first data length. The Examiner further asserts that Bonnell teaches receiving the notification at a remote computer and transforming the notification into a user-friendly display message comprising a second data length, wherein the second data length is significantly greater than the first data length.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Bonnell does not teach transforming a notification having a first data length (from a first computer) into a user-friendly display message comprising a second data length, wherein the second data length is significantly greater than the first data length. In fact, Bonnell does not teach or suggest a notification having a first data length which is greater than, less than or equal to the data length of a user-friendly display message.

Appl. No. : 08/943,356
Filed : October 1, 1997

The Examiner admits that Bonnell does not state the limitation of a notification. The Examiner states that Bonnell discloses an event manager which keeps a record of various occurrences throughout the computer network, including the occurrence of alarm conditions and their resolution. But there is nothing in Bonnell to suggest receiving the notification at a remote (or second) computer and displaying a user-friendly message regarding the status of a component in the first computer, wherein the user-friendly message has a data length that is substantially greater than the data length of a notification from the first computer. Thus, Bonnell does not teach the claimed invention in Claim 11. Withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

As to Claim 12, Claim 12 is dependent from Claim 11. Withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Rejection of Claim 13 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

As to Claim 13, the Examiner takes the position that Bonnell teaches the claimed limitation wherein the act of sending performs simple network management protocol (SNMP) transactions.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. First, Bonnell teaches away from using SNMP transactions for communications between agent software 36 and manager system software 34. Bonnell states "an SNMP system is inefficient and inflexible in that a console must request information from the agent about objects on a piecemeal basis, one request per piece of information, causing increased network traffic as well as overhead in the computer system running the console" (col. 6, lines 10-14). For this reason alone, withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Second, Claim 13 is dependent from Claim 11. As described above with respect to Claim 11, Bonnell does not teach receiving a notification regarding the status of a component in a first computer, at a remote (second computer) and transforming the notification into a user-friendly display message, wherein the user-friendly message has a data length that is substantially greater than the data length of a notification from the first computer. Thus, even if it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bonnell by specifying transactions using SNMP for communications between agent software and manager system software and for remote monitoring and updating of devices in the network, Bonnell does

Appl. No. : 08/943,356
Filed : October 1, 1997

not teach the claimed invention of Claim 11. For this reason alone, withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner relies on only one of the two reasons above for withdrawing the 103(a) rejection, the other reason shall be deemed withdrawn by Applicant and shall not be construed as a basis for patentability relied on by Applicant.

Discussion of Rejection of Claims 14-17 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

As to Claims 14-17, the Examiner admits that Bonnell does not explicitly teach the claimed invention wherein the first code contains an index which is used by the status module to identify user-friendly display messages; wherein the index is predefined by a management information base; wherein the management information base associates information about said component with the index; and wherein the status module uses the information about the component from the management information base to generate the user-friendly message.

The Examiner, however, takes the position that Bonnell discloses a knowledge module parser 44, a knowledge module 38, a knowledge database manager 46, a database 47, a manager software 34 and an event manager 52 which perform the same functionality as the index. The Examiner further asserts, without citing any specific prior art reference, that the use of an index that points to a base of information is well known in the data processing art, and therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bonnell by specifying an index in the event reported to the management console.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claims 14-17 are dependent from Claim 11. As described above with respect to Claim 11, Bonnell does not teach a second (remote) computer displaying a user-friendly message regarding the status of a component in a first computer, wherein the user-friendly display message has a data length that is substantially greater than the data length of a notification from the first computer. Moreover, the knowledge module parser 44, knowledge module 38, knowledge database manager 46, database 47, manager software 34 and event manager 52 disclosed in Bonnell do not perform the same functionality as the index, which is used by the claimed invention to identify a user-friendly display message. Thus, Bonnell does not teach the claimed invention of Claims 14-17. Withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Rejection of Claims 18-19 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Appl. No. : 08/943,356
Filed : October 1, 1997

As to Claims 18-19, the Examiner takes the position that Bonnell teaches the claimed limitation of displaying a description of the notification and the recommended course of action associated with one of the alerts using a graphical user interface 50, an interface 54, an event manager 52, a database 47 and 49.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claims 18-19 are dependent from Claim 11. As stated above with respect to Claim 11, Bonnell does not teach or suggest receiving a notification at a remote (or second) computer, transforming the notification having a first data length (from a first computer) into a user-friendly display message comprising a second data length, wherein the second data length is significantly greater than the first data length, and displaying the user-friendly message regarding the status of a component in the first computer. Claim 18 adds the further limitation of displaying a description of the notification. Claim 19 adds the further limitation of displaying a recommended course of action for the notification. Bonnell does not teach displaying a recommended course of action regarding a notification to the user. Thus, Bonnell does not teach the claimed invention in Claims 18-19. Withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Rejection of Claims 20-27 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner takes the position that Claims 20-27 do not teach or define any new limitations in view of Claims 1-19 and are rejected for similar reasons.

For the reasons stated above with respect to Claims 1-19 above, withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection of Claims 20-27 is respectfully requested. Moreover, for Claims 20-22, Bonnell does not teach receiving an alert, which comprises an index identifying an operational parameter of one of the components of the computer, and transforming the index into a user-friendly display message.

In addition, Claims 23 and 26 have been amended to further clarify the claimed invention. Withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Rejection of Claim 28-31 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner stated that the rejection of Claims 1-27 are fully applied to Claims 28-31. Further, the Examiner admits that Bonnell does not teach the claimed limitation wherein one of the alerts relates to the status of a fan, a temperature sensor, a power supply or a fault isolation unit. The Examiner, however, takes the position that Giorgio teaches a method for monitoring various parameters such as a fan, a temperature sensor, a power supply or a fault isolation unit

Appl. No. : 08/943,356
Filed : October 1, 1997

for equipment at network sites. The Examiner states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bonnell in view of Giorgio so that various parameters are monitored. The Examiner states that one would be motivated to do so to optimize the working parameters of a network node.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Giorgio discloses a network manager which sends a request to a microcontroller, and the microcontroller responds to the request by transferring values monitored by the microcontroller to the network manager (Abstract; Figure 5; col. 6, lines 2-5; col. 8, lines 21-23). Giorgio does not teach an agent sending alerts to a manager.


Claims 28-31 are dependent from Claim 23. Neither Bonnell nor Giorgio teach a method comprising the acts of (1) generating a plurality of alerts which are associated with the monitoring of status information of a computer's components; (2) displaying the alerts on a manager computer; (3) allowing a user to select at least two of the alerts; and (4) disabling the display of the selected alerts to the user in response to a single command from the user. Thus, withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, and such allowance is earnestly solicited. If any issues remain to be resolved, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to promptly resolve any such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 8/18/99

By: 

John M. Carson
Registration No. 34,303
Attorney of Record
620 Newport Center Drive
Sixteenth Floor
Newport Beach, CA 92660
(619) 235-8550